DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 565 TM 820 588

TITLE Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance: Workshop Text I. Overview: Evaluation of Bilingual Programs.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 75p.; For related documents, see TM 820 589-592.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingualism; Documentation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Formative Evaluation; Literature Reviews; Needs Assessment; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Summative Evaluation; *Technical Assistance; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

This introductory text is designed to accompany workshop instruction in evaluating bilingual programs. It is addressed to those involved with bilingual programs generally, educators directly involved in planning and implementation, and research and evaluation specialists. Areas in which evaluation can lead to improved bilingual practice and how a model appropriate in evaluation of bilingual programs can best be used to facilitate that improvement are considered. A review of legislation, a literature review and experience in the field indicate that the most pressing technological and methodological issues relate to the selection or development of appropriate assessment instruments and evaluation designs. Evaluation is defined as the process of selecting, collecting, and interpreting information for the purpose of keeping various audiences informed about a program. The process of creating a bilingual program is discussed as taking place in four phases: needs assessment; program planning; formative evaluation; and summative evaluation. Documentation is presented as an integral part of program development and evaluation. It should fully describe the bilingual practices followed in the program and those events and processes which interact to achieve outcomes. Bilingual program diversity and its implementation, ranging from program type chosen to provisions made for community participation and considerations in planning bilingual evaluations, are discussed. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221565

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance

Workshop Text I

Overview: Evaluation of Bilingual Programs

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Gray
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM820588

Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance

Workshop Text I

Overview: Evaluation of Bilingual Programs

How to Use this Text

Overview: Evaluation of Bilingual Programs is designed to accompany workshop instruction in evaluating bilingual programs. Instructional activities to provide participants with practice on skills presented in this workshop can be found in Participant's Handbook I: Overview: Evaluation of Bilingual Programs.

You will want to read this workshop text before participating in the actual sessions. You might want to complete the "Participant Preparation" form provided at the beginning of the Participant Handbook accompanying this text. Bring questions you have and examples from your own program to the workshop.

Overview: Evaluation of Bilingual Programs addresses three levels of involvement with bilingual evaluation. At the most general level, we hope that all people involved in bilingual programs, both bilingual and non-bilingual program teachers, students, parents, and community members will find the materials valuable. A second audience is educators directly involved in bilingual program planning and implementation who are familiar with many of the general principles of curriculum development and testing, but who have no special training in evaluation. The third group for which the materials were designed is research and evaluation specialists who may not be well-acquainted with the special demands of bilingual program evaluation.

Since sections of the text will be more relevant to one group than to

another, the Table of Contents is keyed by section. Consult the key to identify those parts of the text that match your interests and level of expertise.

Table of Contents

Overview: Evaluation of Bilingual Programs

	Page
Part I: Evaluation Defined	1
CSE's approach to evaluation	1
Needs assessment	1
Program planning	1
Formative evaluation	2
Summative evaluation	2
Documentation	3
CSE's approach to these training materials	4
Part II: Background	6
An historical perspective: the courts	6
Diversity in bilingual programs	13
General problems in the evaluation of bilingual programs	14
Part III: Program Diversity	18
Type of program	18
Population to be served	
Participation of English-speaking students	22
Census	23
Program treatment	24
Grades to be covered and length of time students remain in the program	25
Student/teacher ratio	26
Teacher/staff requirements and qualifications	26

Page

Staff training 28

Materials requirements 28

Community participation 29

Assessment, evaluation, and reporting requirements 30

Needs assessment 30

Student assessment 30

Program evaluation 32

Part IV: Considerations in Planning Bilingual Evaluations

Minimum requirements and design and testing issues 34

Guidelines for reporting 34

Design problems 36

Testing programs 38

Suggestions for practice 40

Needs assessment 42

Student assessment 43

Program evaluation 43

Reporting 44

Type of program 44

Census 46

Population to be served 45

Participation of English-speaking students 45

Program treatment 46

Grades to be covered and length of time students remain in the program 47

Student-teacher ratio 47

Page

Staff training 48

Materials 49

Community participation 49

Conclusion 50

References 52

Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance

Workshop I

Overview: Evaluation of Bilingual Programs

Part I: Evaluation Defined

CSE's Approach to Evaluation

In CSE's approach to evaluation, evaluation is defined as the process of selecting, collecting, and interpreting information for the purpose of keeping various audiences informed about a program. Usually these audiences will use the information to make decisions. The kinds of decisions that need to be made about a bilingual program depend on the stage of development of the program. The process of creating a bilingual program can be seen as taking place in four phases:

Needs assessment: The first phase in the cycle of program development is needs assessment during which the need for the program is established. This phase will involve the assessment of students to determine the range of English language proficiencies that exist and using this information to determine the most appropriate kind of bilingual program to meet students' needs.

Program planning: The second phase in program development is program planning. Here teachers, parents and other community members, curriculum experts, and others will plan a program to meet the high priority goals determined by the needs assessment. Plans should also be laid at this time for the evaluation of the program. This will involve consideration of the best evaluation design, measures to be used, and means of analysis and reporting.

The first two phases are concerned with establishing the program's

goals. A need assessment sets goal priorities; program planning describes the program to reach these goals. Implicit in this model is one prescription about how evaluations should proceed: That is should address the goals and processes of the particular program being evaluated. The evaluator, then, should begin by looking at the goals and processes of the particular bilingual program and design an evaluation that is appropriate to that set of goals and program processes. Further, to ensure the widest use of the information gathered, both for people in the program and for audiences external to the program, the evaluator should also plan to describe and document what the program looks like while it is in operation.

Formative evaluation: Formative evaluation requires collecting and sharing information for program improvement. While a program is being installed, the formative evaluator works to provide the program planners and staff with implementation information to help adjust it to the situation and improve it. Eventually, of course, people will want to know how good the program is, or whether or not to comtinue with the program. But these questions cannot be answered right away. They must await a summative evaluation that asks about the overall value and effect of a program.

While the program is in the developmental stage, the evaluato is attempting to provide a wide range of program implementation information. This information can be used to decide if the program needs to be modified from the original intentions and to make sure that students are making progress. This kind of information will be used to modify and improve the program.

Summative evaluation: Summative evaluation looks at the total impact of the program. When a program has passed its developmental stage and is

functioning as intended, it is ready to be summarily described and perhaps judged. This summary evaluation, the kind of evaluation that is most typically conducted, will include a description of what the program looked like and an estimation of its effect on student outcomes.

Documentation: Implicit in the four phases of program development and evaluation is the notion of program documentation. Documentation of bilingual program is a crucial activity. It adds to the evaluation component an element that fully describes the bilingual practices followed in the program, and those events and processes which interacted to achieve outcomes. This kind of documentation should be in a form that describes all the crucial features of the program. It should be considered an integral part of program operation and evaluation. If worthwhile results are found in a program, the program may be worth maintaining both to test its effects in the furture and to allow others to assess the relevance of the program in another setting. Thus, simple statement of outcome and estimation of effect is not adequate to fully demonstrate program achievements. What is needed is a thorough description which, in conjunction with statements of outcome, will document the interactions of process and events that helped make the program what it is and what it accomplished.

The approach to evaluation described above permits consideration of a broad range of important concerns: context characteristics such as class size, school/district characteristics, and the time frame of the program, student characteristics such as age, differing linguistic backgrounds, ability, and attitudes; program outcomes that include both anticipated and unanticipated effects. It focuses data collection where program effects are most likely to occur; it involves a wide variety of information, both process and outcome. Above all, it attempts to provide credible and

useful information for a broad range of educational decisions.

CSE Approach to These Training Materials

In attempting to provide a model that will be appropriate in the evaluation of bilingual programs, we considered the principal areas in which evaluation can lead to improved bilingual practice, and how the model can best be used to facilitate that improvement. In these efforts, we were guided by legislative and regulatory requirements, review of the literature, technical and methodological issues, and bilingual program administrator's opinions about needed areas of improvement. How information on these concerns was gathered has been described by Burry (1979).

Review of the legislation shows that a great deal of variety may exist in the development, inplementation, and evaluation of a bilingual education program. The literature review indicates that previous work has done little to provide a referent from which to evaluate the educational gains derived from participation in a program of bilingual instruction. This may be explained in part by possible evaluator unfamiliarity with the unique problems of bilingual education, as well as by failure to explore the relationships among instructional strategies, implementation techniques, and program outcomes. Understanding these relations will require greater evaluator attention to delineation of program goals and attainment strategies, as well as consideration of program outcomes in addition to those of a purely cognitive nature. Reporting these relationships in a useful manner will require greater evaluator attention to program description and documentation; greater attention to description and documentation can help provide a referent to interpret program effect. The literature review and experience in the field indicates that the most pressing technological and methodological

issues relate to the selection or development of appropiate assessment instruments and evaluation designs. The survey of bilingual program administrators indicated that the greatest needs for improvement are planning, managing and using evaluation information, testing practices, and evaluation designs.

Part II: Background

An Historical Perspective: The Courts

Stimulated by such forces as federal and state legislation, court decisions, and community pressure, school districts are increasingly being asked to provide bilingual/bicultural education programs to their non-and-limited-English-speaking pupils. The legal mandate for bilingual education has been documented by Teitelbaum and Hiller (1977). The growth of bilingual/bicultural education has been particularly influenced by the federal Bilingual Education Act of 1968, which provided the first federal funds for bilingual education, and the Bilingual Education Act of 1974 which states that instruction should be provided in English as well as in the native language of limited-English-speaking students "to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system." In addition, "Instruction will be given with appreciation of the cultural heritage of such children." (ESEA Title VII, 1974).

Of principal importance in bilingual education is the case of Lau v. Nichols (1974) and the Lau remedies (1975) established by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). The time at which Lau was decided is of great importance, since by 1974 many of the country's school districts were receiving federal aid and thus were subject to the regulations of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 stating that no one, on the basis of race, color, or national origin, can be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program receiving federal financial assistance. Further, application of Title VI in Lau was assisted by establishment of the right of individuals to sue for enforcement, and by the regulations concerning

the schooling of children of national minority origin.

Lau v. Nichols was brought by Chinese public school students against the San Francisco Unified School District in 1970. The parties did not dispute the fact that Chinese students received no services to meet their linguistic needs and that these students suffered educationally. The issue was whether non-English-speaking students receive an equal educational opportunity when they are instructed in a language they cannot understand.

The plaintiffs argued that the absence of programs to meet the linguistic needs of such students violated both Title VI and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Their point was that equality in education requires more than the simple provision of the same facilities and materials to students. The Chinese students claimed that since they could not understand the language of instruction they were denied an education equal to that of other students. They claimed that the state was responsible for their educational exclusion since attendance was compulsory, the English language was mandated by the state, and English fluency was a prerequisite to high school graduation. The difference in the treatment they were accorded, the plaintiffs argued, constituted discrimination because it affected a distinct national origin group, and because the Constitution prohibited withholding from them the means of comprehending the language of instruction.

Their claims were rejected by the federal district court, which ruled that their rights to an equal educational opportunity had been met since the education made available to them was the same as that made available to other students in the San Francisco Unified School District. With one dissent, that judgment was affirmed by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which held that the uniform use of English did not constitute

unlawful discrimination and stated that English language instruction must be paramount in schooling.

The Lau petitioners then took their case to the Supreme Court. At this time, since HEW was concerned with the effect of the lower court decisions on policies regarding non-English-speaking students and on HEW authority to govern the use of bilingual education funds, the United States was allowed to argue in support of the Lau petitioners as friends of the court. And while the federal government offered the same constitutional arguments as the Lau petitioners, the federal case was based largely on Title VI guidelines and HEW's right to set reasonable conditions on the receipt of federal funds. The federal position was that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was wrong in dismissing the federal claim based on Title VI as if it were no different from the claim of Fourteenth Amendment rights. The government asserted that the HEW regulations and guidelines of Title VI should receive great consideration based on previous Supreme Court findings. The government claimed that regardless of how the Court construed the principles of Equal Protection as applied to Lau, HEW's interpretation of Title VI outlawed the actions of the San Francisco Unified School District. The Supreme Court agreed unanimously, but based their decision solely on Title VI which avoided the constitutional question.

The Lau judgment raises important questions about equal treatment. The Supreme Court examined whether students who do not understand English receive equal treatment when English is the only language of instruction and no provisions are made to teach them English. The Court reasoned that providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum does not constitute equality of treatment, since students who do not understand English are thus barred from meaningful education. In reaching this decision,

the Supreme Court relied on Title VI regulations and guidelines banning discrimination.

The Court's decision was influenced by a HEW memorandum of May 25,1970, concerning students of national-origin minority groups with limited-English language skills. The memorandum informed school districts that they must take affirmative steps to rectify English language deficiencies--steps going beyond the provision of the same materials and teachers to students and which open the instructional program to English-language deficient students by attempting to rectify the language deficiency. Although bilingual education was the relief originally sought, by the time Lau reached the Ninth Circuit Court this request for specific relief had been abandoned and all that was sought was effective affirmative steps by the school district. The Supreme Court decision did not mandate a specific approach to teaching students with English language deficiencies.

In response to the Supreme Court mandate, the San Francisco Board of Education approved a plan providing for a bilingual-bicultural program for the Chinese, Filipino, and Spanish language students in the school district. These students constituted 82 percent of the San Francisco students speaking little or no English. Students from other language groups were to be provided with ESL and other special programs, including bilingual instruction where feasible.

The impact of Lau is seen in legislation at federal and state levels and in several lawsuits. Seven months after the Lau ruling, congress codified the Court's judgement in the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974. This federal legislation extends Lau to all public school districts, not simply those receiving federal funds. The Lau prescription cannot now be circumvented by a school district refusing federal funds.

Since Lau, the decisions of Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools (1974) and Aspira of New York, Inc., v. Board of Education of the City of New York (1974) have led to court-mandated bilingual programs. A third decision, Rios v. Read (1977), looked at the school district's responsibilities, indicating that unless the district's bilingual program were effective, it would be considered a Lau violation the same as if no program were offered. A fourth decision, Otero v. Mesa County Valley School District No. 51 (1975) rejected all claims of national origin discrimination and, having found no Lau violations, did not reach remedial problems.

Serna held that school children had a right to bilingual education. While the amount of bilingual instruction ordered was not extensive, the plan is significant in that English-dominant Chicano and Anglo students were required to receive some bilingual education.

Under the consent decree of Aspira, the school board is required to design and implement an improved method for assessing Hispanic students' skills in English and Spanish in order to identify those students with English language difficulties who, accordingly, have rights under Lau. For eligible students, instruction in core courses and other courses required for promotion and graduation must be offered in Spanish. The decree also requires programs designed to develop children's ability to speak, read, write, and understand English. It specifically rejects immersion as a technique of second language acquisition and forbids pullout programs.

In Rios, the school district argued that Lau requires only that a school district take affirmative steps to meet the needs of non-English speaking students. While the district court acknowledged that the school district did provide a remedial program for English language deficient students, that

a bilingual department existed in the district, and that New York State's policy is to encourage bilingual education, it rejected the claim that any affirmative steps would satisfy Lau. The court held that an inadequate program is as harmful to a student who does not speak English as no program at all; increasing the quantity of bilingual programs is meaningless unless there is a concomitant emphasis on the quality of instruction.

In the summer of 1975, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare issued recommendations for meeting the requirements of the Lau decision. Establishing a Lau violation by proving that a school district offers no program to meet the needs of limited-English speaking students is easier than deciding on the kind of program that will be sufficient to remedy a given Lau violation. In this regard, the Lau remedies outline the educational approaches found to be appropriate affirmative steps toward opening the instructional program to non-English speaking students. School districts are required to develop and submit to OCR voluntary compliance plans if they are found to be noncompliant with Title VI and if they have twenty or more students of the same language group who have been identified as having a primary or home language other than English. These twenty students need not all be students with limited-English language ability. School districts with a lone student with limited-English language ability are obliged to take affirmative steps, although these are not expected to be as extensive and comprehensive as they would be in other districts.

There are many conceptions of what constitutes appropriate instruction for students with English language deficiencies--ranging from ESL to bilingual-bicultural programs. The Lau remedies notwithstanding, many experts do not consider ESL to constitute bilingual education. For these people, ESL would

be considered a useful component of a bilingual program. But its emphasis on the acquisition of English--would not permit it to be seen as an acceptable sutstitute for bilingual education.

Proponents of bilingual-bicultural education believe that such programs are more than compensatory in nature; that bilingual-bicultural programs accomplish more than just make up for lack of English language skills. Bilingual-bicultural education involves the use of two languages in a curriculum that includes the students' historical, literary, and cultural traditions.

The Lau remedies do not mandate bilingual education. For instance, they endorse ESL as one of the acceptable options at the high school level. They also approve of ESL for students at the intermediate level who do not speak exclusively a language other than English. Even at the elementary level, where ESL is categorically rejected, bilingual education is not required. In fact, school districts may pursue educational approaches other than those outlined in the Lau remedies. The important stipulation is that they must demonstrate affirmatively that the educational program offered will be effective in ensuring equal educational opportunity. In dealing with the courts, it will be difficult for school districts to assert that the Lau remedies are unreasonable or inconsistent with Title VI, especially since program approaches are presented as options in the remedies; bilingual education is not mandated, and alternative programs are acceptable if they can be shown to be equally effective.

For those who view bilingual-bicultural education as being more than a compensatory program, the results of litigation may be less than

satisfactory. But litigation is not the only tactic that has been used in the promotion of bilingual education. Not all school districts need to be threatened with legal action to address the educational needs of linguistic minority students. There have been successful efforts to pass state legislation mandating bilingual education. Community pressure on school districts has also been successful. These other means of advancing bilingual education might be explored before resorting to the courts.

Diversity in Bilingual Programs

Since the passage of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, the explicit goal of bilingual education has been: to develop English language proficiency for the limited or non-English speaking child (LES/NES) so that he or she will be able to progress as effectively as possible through the educational system. This support for bilingual education, however, has varied in focus and intensity, perhaps because there is no clear national policy toward bilingual education. Beyond lack of national policy, the great variation in the design and implementation of bilingual programs across the country has contributed to the debate regarding the purposes and merits of bilingual education. Research to date has still to provide answers to issues that are basic to a definition of bilingual education. That is, there is still a great need for empirical resolution of questions stemming from linguistic concerns, attitudinal concerns, development and language acquisition concerns, concerns of dominance and proficiency, and psychological concerns.

Federal and state legislation has produced a variety of programs that vary in terms of type of program, population served, census requirements, program treatment, grade levels served and length of participation, student-teacher ratio, staff qualifications and training, material requirements,

and community participation. These variations are described in Part Three of this document.

General Problems in the Evaluation of Bilingual Programs

Evaluation generally has not provided very useful information about what bilingual programs are like, nor the range of outcomes and level of success they achieve. Among the reasons for this failure are the following:

(1) many of the people called upon to evaluate bilingual programs, though well versed in the general area of educational evaluation, have tended to be unfamiliar with the particular needs and characteristics of bilingual education.

(2) evaluations of bilingual programs have frequently provided little more than vague descriptions of the nature and content of the programs, and such information has been of limited use to decision makers.

(3) the diversities among bilingual programs are great, and the extent to which these differences are related to differential development across programs is still open to question. There is a great need to reach agreement on some basic assumptions as to what constitutes a minimum bilingual program and the kinds of achievement gains and other outcomes that might be expected of the program. The practice of attempting to measure the effects of a bilingual program without first determining whether in fact a bilingual program actually exists and precisely what it is attempting to accomplish makes it difficult to establish valid criteria for determining success or failure.

(4) even assuming the development of valid criteria, evaluators must still explore the relationships among instructional strategies, implementation techniques, and program outcomes. Previous efforts have not successfully established these relationships.

(5) there is still a lack of adequate instruments for the assessment of students of limited-English speaking ability.

(6) there is a great problem in the matter of designs appropriate to the evaluation of bilingual programs. The fundamental question regarding these programs has been to determine whether the scholastic achievement of students in bilingual programs is equal to or better than what it would have been had they remained in a regular, unilingual program of instruction. Two factors greatly hinder the generation of reliable findings: (a) bilingual programs are intended to provide adequate education for a broad range of LES students and (b) methodological pro lems of participant selection are likely to obscure program results.

Some of the above shortcomings are explained, at least in part, by current evaluation practice. That is, a great many bilingual program evaluations appear to be driven by an approach that relates the methods of evaluation with those of research. In the present materials we make a distinction between evaluation and research. The distinction between evaluation and research is important; it goes far beyond questions of topic of interest or techniques employed. Rather, the distinction involves fundamental differences in how information is generated, the kinds of information generated, and the intended uses of the information.

Cronbach and Suppes (1969) in their discussions of modes of inquiry, cite the need to

> ...distinguish decision-oriented from conclusion-oriented investigations. In a decision-oriented study the investigator is asked to provide information wanted by a decision maker: a school administrator, a governmental policy-maker, the manager of a project...or the like. The decision-oriented study is a commissioned study. The decision maker believes that he needs information to guide his actions and he poses the question to the investigator. The conclusion-oriented study, on the other hand, takes its direction from the investigator's commitments and hunches. The educational decision-maker can, at most, arouse the investigator's interest in a problem. The latter formulates his own question, usually a general one rather than a question about a particular institution. The aim is to conceptualize and understand the chosen phenomenon; a particular finding is only a means to that end. (pp. 20-21)

In light of this distinction, CSE categorizes evaluation as decision-oriented study and research as conclusion-oriented study. Evaluation differs from research intended to produce results of general significance; evaluation, with its decision orientation, is intended to provide results that are relevant for a particular program at a specific point in time. It differs from conclusion-oriented research in the reasons for conducting the work, the constraints imposed by the institutional setting in which the work is conducted, and the intended use of the information generated. Evaluation should generate information that will lead to decisions about educational questions and problems within a particular setting.

The decision orientation toward evaluation considers both the times at which evaluations might be conducted as well as the manner in which the evaluation is conducted. It points out phases in the development of a program during which various audiences might effectively use credible information. It does not assume there is a single approach to evaluation which is universally appropriate. Rather, the approach to evaluation is guided by the kind of bilingual program to be evaluated, the context or setting in which the program operates, and the real-world constraints with which the program operators must work.

The distinction between "research" and "evaluation" should not be interpreted to mean that research and evalution are mutually exculsive categories. Evaluations often employ research methodology in order to enhance the generalizability of their findings. Further, many evaluations include some research questions. For example, hypotheses regarding the relationship between certain aspects of the instructional program and student outcomes may be tested. Evaluation, then may encompass research and is a somewhat "larger" activity. Research and evaluation are complementary activities that may at first appear to have different purposes; however, in the complex world of the evaluation of bilingual programs there may be a place for both pursuits.

Part III: Program Diversity

One of the characteristics of bilingual programs is their diversity. The term "bilingual" may refer to different theories of instruction for second language learners. Each of these theories, in turn, is attended by different staffing needs, materials, instructional treatments, and even student populations served. This section discusses several of the ways in which bilingual programs can differ from each other along the major dimensions of program implementation, ranging from type of program chosen to kinds of provisions made for community participation.

Type of Program

A principal issue in bilingual education concerns program goals and philosophies. While there is little controversy about the expected English language growth of students, there is still a great deal of debate about the goals for native language outcomes. Programs may be transitional, advocating a shift to instruction in English as soon as the student can perform successfully in English, or maintenance, advocating the development and maintenance of language skills in both English and the native language.

Federal legislation provides for transitional bilingual programs. Instruction in and study of the native language of the children of limited-English-speaking ability, is to occur "to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system."

All of the states which have legislation establishing bilingual education have provisions for transitional programs. But some states allow maintenance programs and transitional programs, and one of those states mandates programs at the elementary level serving certain numbers

of non- or limited-English-speaking students, which will develop and maintain the basic language skills in both languages, or will enable the pupil to achieve competency in both languages.

The curriculum developed for a maintenance program may differ substantially from that intended for a transitional one. For example, some programs for limited-English-speaking students may stress the development of reading skills in the primary language during a student's early participation in the program, with the English curriculum emphasizing oral language development. Instruction in English reading may be introduced when the child has achieved a certain level of oral English and/or reading proficiency in the primary language. Other programs may emphasize the development of reading skills in English as soon as possible.

Although maintenance and transitional programs may have the same ultimate goal for English language achievement, the rate of growth and the stage in the educational process at which the growth takes place may differ.

At the broadest level, bilingual education programs appear to fall in four broad areas:

--Programs of instruction in which all required courses are taught in the language of the students of limited-English-speaking ability and in English, and in which instruction is given in the comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing of the non-English language and of English. The principal goals of these programs can be the development and maintenance of both languages, or the development of both

languages until the student has achieved a level of English language ability which will allow him/her to perform at an adequate level in a classroom where instruction is conducted solely in English.

-- Programs of instruction in which courses are taught in the language of the students of limited-English-speaking ability, for all or a part of the curriculum, and in English, and in which instruction is given in the comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing of English. The major goal of these programs is the development of the student's English language ability through the use of both languages until the student is able to perform at an adequate level in a program where instruction is conducted solely in English.

-- Programs where instruction is conducted in English with special English language instruction for students of limited-English-speaking ability. These may include English as a Second Language programs (ESL) or High Intensity Language Training (Hilt) programs. The major goal of these programs is the development of the students' English language skills as soon as possible in order to facilitate their transition into the regular school program.

-- Programs in which English-speaking students receive instruction in the language of the students of limited-English-speaking ability. These programs may concentrate on the development of oral skills in the non-English language, at least at the lower grade levels. Instruction in other subjects is conducted primarily in English. The major goal of these programs is to teach another language to English speaking students.

Population to be Served

Another major issue is the determination of who is to be served by a bilingual program. The legislatures and the courts have established guidelines which permit differing interpretation and prevent development of widely applicable criteria.

There is little question that non-English-speaking students are to be served by bilingual programs. But with respect to students who speak English, given the wide range of English language ability possible, the question of program eligibility is more difficult to resolve.

Different states deal with this issue in different ways. In some states, in addition to linguistic and/or cultural factors, general academic performance is taken into account when identifying the population to be served. Here the most frequently applied criterion is that the student is unable to profit from regular classroom instruction.

Language proficiency or language dominance are frequently cited, and the distinction between the two is important. Language proficiency refers to an individual's competence in one language irrespective of performance in the other language. A judgment of proficiency calls for a consideration of oral and aural competence as well as reading and writing skills. Language dominance, on the other hand, is a term of dual language classification and considers the student's relative fluency in each language. The student is generally reported to be stronger in one language than the other, or equal in both; such information may not report on the student's full competence in either. Judgments of language dominance are often restricted to the student's aural and oral abilities in the two languages under consideration.

English language ability is the focal point in selecting students to participate in bilingual programs. But even in this regard, selection criteria vary substantially. One state, for example, stipulates that a student is eligible for the program if "the student speaks (English) without apparent difficulty but displays low achievement indicating some language or cultural interference with learning." Another state allows those students to participate "who speak English exclusively but whose manner of speaking reflects the grammatical structure of another language" if these students have an overall achievement which is at or below "minus one standard deviation on a normed test; or one year below grade level as measured by the district's ongoing student achievement testing program." Most states, however, are less specific in their provisions; for example, one definition of limited-English-speaking students is "those children whose primary language is other than English and who have difficulty performing ordinary classwork in English."

Participation of English-Speaking Students

A majority of the states with bilingual legislation allow the voluntary participation of English-speaking students, though priority is generally given to students who are limited-English-speaking. Seven states neither prohibit nor provide for the participation of English-speaking students. One state stipulates that "students who speak primarily English are not eligible to participate...;" another permits their participation "unless (it) will hinder the progress of the non-English dominant students."

Only one state sets a specific minimum number of English-speaking students, and requires that "not more than two-thirds of the pupils enrolled shall be limited-English-speaking pupils." A few states stipulate that the majority of the students shall be limited-English-speaking; however, one of these states will not reimburse districts for the education of English-speaking students, and another allows their participation "to the extent that it is economically feasible."

Census

Fourteen states require a census to determine the numbers of students in need of bilingual instruction. Some states require reporting by district and others by school. Generally, the assessment is applicable at all grade levels; but one state requires only the reporting of students in kindergarten through third grade.

The states differ in their census provisions. One state, for example, requires that students be classified according to the categories established by the Lau remedies; another requires that students be reported by race and national origin; another provides for the reporting of the achievement level of students identified as limited-English-speaking; still another provides for the assessment and reporting of the English language proficiency of limited-English-speaking students. Other states are less specific, requiring only the reporting of the numbers of children of limited-English-speaking ability.

The census results can be used for several purposes, but they are generally used to determine when bilingual programs must be instituted and what type of program will be required. They are also used to allocate financial resources on the basis of need.

Twelve of the states with bilingual education legislation specifically mandate bilingual programs. The number of eligible students in the school system is the main issue in mandating a program, but the necessary numbers and the levels at which these numbers are reported vary. For example, one state requires the establishment of a bilingual program if a school district has an "enrollment of 20 or more children of limited-English-speaking ability in a language classification in grades K-12." Another state mandates a program of bilingual education when there are in any public school within a local or regional school district 20 or more eligible children classified as dominant in any one language other than English." Still another state requires that a district "develop a plan for a bilingual and bicultural education program in a school having 50 or more students in grades kindergarten through third with linguistically different skills...;" and one state mandates a certain type of program when the "census indicates that any school of a school district has 10 or more non-English-speaking pupils or 15 or more limited-English-speaking pupils with the same primary language in the same grade level, or in the same age group, in a multigrade or ungraded instructional environment...."

Program Treatment

The major provisions in the legislation concerning kinds of programs to be instituted pertain to language use and language outcomes. All of the programs permitted or mandated are intended to develop full competence in English. As mentioned previously, some also provide for the development of competence in the language other than English. The majority of the laws provide for the use of two languages in instruction. All provide

for instruction of English, while some provide for instruction of the languages other than English. The numbers and linguistic abilities of students served are important considerations in determining the type of program to be instituted; and there are variations within one or two states as to what type of program a district must provide depending on the enrollment and linguistic variation of students in need of the program.

In addition to considerations of language, there is also legislation calling for instruction in the culture associated with the native language of the students of limited-English-speaking ability, and in the history and culture of the United States. Others provide that instruction be given in the cultural heritage of the students. Some states have additional specifications; for example, that programs utilize the cultural and linguistic background of the students in the curriculum, and that they teach the students to appreciate the value of different languages and cultures. One state provides for the teaching of the cultural heritage of the students and the contribution made by that cultural group to the community, state, and country. It further encourages districts to teach the language of the minority to monolingual speakers of English in order to promote a pluralistic concept of America.

Grades to be Covered and Length of Time Students Remain in the Program

The majority of states which have adopted bilingual legislation do not limit the grades that may be served by the programs, nor do they restrict the length of time students may remain in the program. Some states permit students to remain in the program until they can perform "ordinary"

classwork in English. In other states with transitional programs, such stipulations may be assumed if not specifically stated.

But some states do limit funding to certain grades and some limit the time for program participation. Grade restrictions affect the length of time students are in the program and therefore influence the time available to accomplish objectives. In particular, the objectives established for performance in the non-English language, and the rate stipulated for English language acquisition, will be affected.

Student/Teacher Ratio

Seven of the laws have established a maximum student/teacher ratio. Six stipulate that the state or federal education agency set the maximum ratio; one state provides for that ratio in the law.

There are substantial differences in the established ratios. For example, one set of regulations stipulates that the maximum student/teacher ratio in bilingual classrooms will not be higher than the overal ratio for the district; another state stipulates that the maximum ratio shall not exceed 32:1. Still another stipulates that the class size in grades one through three shall not exceed 28 if no aide is provided; with the assistance of an aide, a teacher may supervise a class which may not exceed 38 students; in kindergarten the ratio shall be 25:1. One other state stipulates that the class size may not exceed 15 students, and if a para-professional is present it may not exceed 20 students.

Teacher/Staff Requirements and Qualifications

The majority of states provide some minimum standards for teachers, and in some instances for other staff participating in the program. In

addition, thirteen states have adopted certification requirements for teachers of bilingual education programs. One state, which has not adopted legislation establishing bilingual education, requires the possession of bilingual certificates for bilingual education teachers.

The laws generally require that teachers in bilingual programs be regularly certificated, and that they possess a specified level of education. Most states further require that teachers have competence in both English and the language of the children of limited-English-speaking ability served by the program. Five states specifically provide for knowledge of the cultural background of the students being served. Three of these states stipulate that teachers should share the culture of the students, but one of these states provides that the determination of the cultural background of the teachers shall not be based solely on ethnic or genetic origins.

Training or experience in bilingual education is a frequent requirement, especially knowledge of bilingual education methodologies. The federal legislation refers to ability and experience in activities to develop listening, speaking, reading, writing, and other academic skills in English and the dominant language of the students. One state includes the ability to teach the history and culture of the United States and the native land of the students served. Where teachers with the established qualifications are not availabe, exemptions are frequently permitted. However, it is expected that temporary staff will gain the competencies required or will be required or will be replaced by teachers with the requisite qualifications.

Provisions are sometimes made for other program staff. These include teachers' aides, community coordinators, bilingual counselors, project directors, or bilingual supervisors.

Staff Training

The lack of adequately prepared staff has been one of the greatest obstacles encountered in establishing bilingual education programs. In response to this situation most states have made provisions for training program staff in bilingual education competencies. These provisions include cooperation with institutions of higher education, participation in short-term institutes or conferences for project staff, pre-service and in-service training workshops, and opportunities to observe demonstrations in the classroom and gain experience by working with experienced project staff.

Materials Requirements

The laws for the most part are silent or unspecific in their provisions concerning materials for use in bilingual programs. Eleven states make no specific stipulation of materials, and of the rest, the majority merely provide for their acquisition and development.

Federal legislation focuses on the development and dissemination of materials suitable for bilingual programs. To this end federal provisions have been made for materials development centers, dissemination and assessment centers, and a clearinghouse for bilingual education. Similarly, one state has made provisions for the development of resource centers. A number of states have made the state departments of education responsible for the review and evaluation of materials.

Community Participation

The majority of the laws call for community participation in bilingual programs. There are considerable differences among the state provisions, but they generally provide for the organization through which the community will participate, the means of selecting the community members, the composition of the community group, and their role in the program.

Generally the legislation provides that committees be established through which the community will participate in the program. Some committees are to be established at the district level, others at the school level, and in some cases, a combination of district and school level committees are required. Two states do not mandate the establishment of committees, but stipulate that parents should be involved in the program. Some states require that the committee members be elected while others provide that they be appointed by the principal. One state requires that the committee members be selected in a manner which fairly represents the views of parents in the district.

Most of the laws provide for a majority of the committee members to be parents of children participating in the program. In some states the legislation states that the committee be composed of parents of limited-English-speaking students and of English-speaking students in the same proportions as the two student groups in the program.

The level of specificity with which state laws define the nature of community involvement varies considerably. Generally, the community committees are intended to participate in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program. In some cases the community committees must approve the program plan prior to its submittal. Other community

committee activities mentioned are selecting the schools to participate in the program, establishing program goals and objectives, selecting program personnel, assisting in the district needs assessment, participating in the language assessment process, and disseminating information about the program.

Assessment, Evaluation, and Reporting Requirements:

Considerable attention is given in the legislation and the regulations to requirements of needs assessment, student assessment, evaluation and reporting.

Needs assessment: Information establishing the need for bilingual education is a common provision. Needs assessments generally include information on the numbers of students who meet the requirements for program eligibility and the numbers of these students to be served by the proposed programs. Two states require additional information: one stipulates that the state department of education will provide information on student dropout, retention, special education placement, and achievement performance; the other requires information on age, language, race, national origin, and family income of students of limited-English-speaking ability and their concentrations in schools. This latter state, in addition, requires information on the placement rate of those limited-English-speaking students who are in classes for the handicapped, as well as their achievement scores, mobility rates, and dropout rates in comparison with average district figures.

Student assessment: Perhaps the most difficult area, and that in which there is the greatest difference in the legislative mandates, is student assessment. Students must be assessed to establish their eligibility for the program and their progress in the program. States allow for varying approaches in the selection of instruments. In some states the local school

district is permitted to select or develop its own instruments; in others, the district must present the rationale for selecting a particular instrument. Sometimes local officials must select an instrument from a pool of state approved instruments, and in others the school district must use state-mandated instruments.

The assessment of students to determine program eligibility depends on the state's definition of students to be served. For example, eligibility may be based on home language use; language dominance or language proficiency; oral language only, or reading and writing ability as well; and/or student achievement, including the use of norms.

Substantial differences exist in how students may be identified. Some laws are general in their requirements. For example, the federal legislation only requires that school districts describe how and when students were assessed to determine limited-English-speaking ability. Local education agencies must provide a description of the assessment instrument, a rationale for its selection, and the procedures to be followed in its use. One state requires that instruments be normed for the geographic area, and that they be valid for identifying students with linguistically different skills; another stipulates that the instruments must be selected and administered so as to avoid racial or cultural discrimination.

Some states are more specific in their assessment provisions. One state requires the assessment of English language proficiency with instruments approved by the state. Another requires the assessment of oral comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing of English. Yet another recommends using objective measures of English language proficiency and comparing the child's language with that of a typical English-speaking student of the

same age; this state also permits subjective measures such as teacher opinion, peer interaction, and parent information. In addition to information on language proficiency, another state provides for the use of information such as reading and arithmetic skill levels and other course grades of limited-English-speaking students in relation to their classmates; this information may indicate a lack of progress due to limited-English-speaking skills. One other state requires the use of a parent questionnaire to identify students who speak a language other than English, and then a language assessment instrument to be administered to students identified in the parent questionnaire.

Once students have been selected for the program, they must be assessed to determine program effectiveness, and in some instances to determine when students are ready to enter into the regular school curriculum. Most states require an annual assessment of students. Federal legislation and the legislation in one state require pre-and posttesting. The areas to be assessed include basic skills listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing in English, and proficiency in the other language to the extent that instruments are available.

Program evaluation: Besides student assessment, general provisions are made in the legislation for program evaluation. A few states provide for reporting the extent to which the program objectives were achieved. One state provides for the conduct of a comprehensive evaluation to include the assessment of pupil achievement, educational processes, and program results, as well as the attitudes of the people involved in and affected by the programs. Another provides for an evaluation plan to include process and product evaluation, management, parental and community involovement, staff development, and materials development, acquisition and use. Yet another state in-

cludes the reporting of per pupil cost of the program; and another requires the certification that funds have been used for the specified purposes. One state provides that, in addition to an evaluation of pupil progress, programs will identify variables which may have affected student academic achievement, including other programs.

Reporting requirements: Provisions are made for the reporting of the evaluation information to specific populations. These include reports from the state education agency to the governor and the legislature, to the local school districts,and to the public. Local agencies may be required to submit reports to the state education agency, district patrons, staff members, the local accountability committee, and the local board of education.

PART IV:

CONSIDERATIONS IN PLANNING BILINGUAL EVALUATIONS

Minimum Requirements and Design and Testing Issues

Guidelines for Reporting

The minimum requirements for Title VII basic programs as amended by the regulations published in the Federal Register March 29, 1979, include

- the evaluation should assess project progress in achieving its Title VII objectives in all components
- evaluation of pupil achievement should provide for some comparison of performance on reading skills in English and in the non-English language, with an estimate of what performance would have been in the absence of the program. Comparisons may be based on local, regional, or national norms on standardized tests; on historical data; or on achievement scores of a comparison or control group. The limitations of such comparisons must be recognized in data analysis and interpretation.
- instruments to evaluate student performance should be described, as well as the rationale for their selection and procedures for use
- pre- and posttest results should be reported on all participating students (and comparison students if used) using means, standard deviations, and appropriate tests of statistical significance
- procedures should be established for determining when students no longer need assistance in developing proficiency in English; this includes an individual evaluation of each student enrolled in the program for two years to determine if he/she should remain in the program.

A major consideration in planning a bilingual program evaluation, then, is to consider the establishment of an appropriate standard of comparison and the selection or development of measures appropriate to the desired means of comparison. These decisions should be influenced by the particular features of the program being evaluated and relevant federal, state, and local requirements. As the evaluator becomes familiar with the program

being evaluated, he or she must keep in mind the basic requirements of an acceptable evaluation and the design and testing issues associated with these requirements.

Federal regulations call for comparisons based on local, regional, or national norms on standardized tests, on historical data, or on achievement scores of a comparison or control group. As will be seen, it is generally impossible to establish a control group to provide a precise estimate of how well students would have done without the program. However, the evaluator should attempt to make the best estimate available within the constraints of the particular program, noting any limitations stemming from the comparison used as the basis of the estimate.

Once the standard of comparison has been established, tests and other measures appropriate to the type of comparison can then be selected or developed. Tests, whether selected or developed, should possess acceptable technical properties, match as closely as possible the curriculum taught in the program, and match the language used for instruction. Given the current limitations of both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests, and because not all aspects of a bilingual project can be assessed by achievement measures, it may be useful to develop a broad data base. This base may rely on standardized and criterion-referenced tests, as well as other measurement techniques such as questionnaires and observations. A broad data base, in addition to serving the need of program documentation, may help to alleviate some of the more troublesome design problems discussed below.

Design Problems

In general, program evaluations are conducted to provide evidence of a program's success. Program evaluations require an acknowledged standard such as a comparison group, established norms, or individual pupil histories. Program evaluations try to answer the basic question - "Did the students in bilingual programs achieve as well or better than if they had remained in a regular, unilingual program?"

Two factors pose design problems for evaluating bilingual programs: (1) the broad range of non-English speaking students; and (2) the methodological problems of participant selection.

Many designs have been proposed based on comparison groups. Yet, bilingual programs often cannot be studied experimentally, because legislation or program administrators may prohibit withholding bilingual services from students who are entitled to such services. Hence, because of both legal and ethical considerations, students who might benefit from bilingual services cannot be randomly assigned to a non-treatment comparison group.

In addition, bilingual programs do not consist of a single isolated treatment that can be evaluated experimentally. Many employ multiple compensatory efforts which overlap, so student progress might be due to any combination of these treatments.

For these reasons, evaluations frequently use designs other than randomized controlled experimental designs. However, these non-experimental comparisons are confounded in various ways. Therefore, the acquisition of reliable baseline data provides information that helps the evaluator

determine whether a program has had a significant effect on student performance. Gathering baseline data means collecting information prior to the implementation of the program in order to compare that data to the results of the program. For example, it may be necessary to consider sources of student ability differences. Issues to explore include the initial linguistic status of the student, the period in the student's development in which the second language is introduced, and the length of time the student has been in the program. Such factors could either be controlled when evaluating program impact, or could be examined as to the effect they have on the education of a bilingual student.

Initial language dominance and/or proficiency must be considered when evaluating the effects of a program. Language dominance and proficiency are often the primary criteria for the selection of students who will participate in bilingual programs. In addition to its application in student placement, initial diagnosis of language skill is also important to the understanding of test relevance and interpretation of subsequent test performance by students. Previous bilingual evaluations have revealed that the continuum of relative fluency in both English and the non-English language can be extremely large among bilingual program students. Thus, proper generalizability about the students being served is dependent on the approximate accounting of the heterogeneity of the dual language skills present in programs. By

contrasting like language groups, it may be possible to provide much more detailed information about program effect. By estimating a student's educational gains in terms of the linguistic group of which he/she is a member, the gain derived is also likely to be more reliable.

The appropriate time for introduction of a second language and for the introduction of reading, and the length of time students are to be in a program before final assessment are issues which may demand longitudinal (more than a one or two-year time span) evaluation. The use of longitudinal studies is critical to answer the questions of how two languages should be used within an entire program curriculum and what ages are more conducive to language learning and, consequently, achievement, than other ages. Because of the number of variables involved, bilingual program evaluation should be based on (1) multiple questions (not just whether students educationally benefited more by program participation as opposed to remaining in regular classes) and (2) multiple analytic designs (rather than the traditional cross-sectional design associated with end-of-year, summative evaluations).

Testing Problems

Lack of adequate instruments for the assessment of students of limited-English-speaking ability presents another problem to evaluators. Much has been said about the inadequacy of standardized tests for the assessment of culturally and linguistically different students. These limitations are magnified when norms are used, since LES students are generally under represented in the field-testing and norming sample and separate norms for these groups are not available. Moreover, even when

adequate field testing has been conducted among LES/NES students, the possible linguistic and cultural biases of many standardized instruments contribute to their questionable validity and reliability. The problems are particularly acute with respect to English language measures, but are often equally pervasive in instruments that are simply translations from English language versions.

There is a serious lack of technically sound instruments which are culturally and programmatically appropriate for limited-English speakers. Test scores obtained on instruments currently in use can vary considerably based on the congruency between the curriculum and test content.

An alternative to the use of standardized tests is the use of criterion-referenced tests. These tests may potentially provide a more accurate indication of the extent to which students have mastered the objectives of their instructional program. They may be particularly useful for diagnostic and prescriptive information at the local level. But criterion-referenced tests also have limitations. Sparse technical information is available on these tests, and the appropriateness of using them across projects may be questionable. Further, because of the varying lack of difficulty of items and objectives, it is difficult compare an achievement score on one test to another.

The preceding design and testing issues should be kept in mind while the evaluator examines the characteristics of the program to be evaluated.

Suggestions for Practice

As mentioned previously, the various states with legislation on bilingual education have attempted to meet federal requirements and to serve the needs of the students in their states in a variety of ways. Further, we have discussed a range of current limitations in design and testing matters. As evaluators of bilingual programs begin to plan, they must therefore consider the various agencies--federal, state, and local--giving direction to the program. The legitimate differences that exist among programs point out the inappropriateness of applying one set of design or test criteria to all bilingual programs. Rather, the evaluator must constantly consider the particular needs of the program being evaluated, recognize the inherent difficulties in design and testing, and attempt to plan an evaluation that is appropriate to the program and feasible within its constraints.

It is critical that the goals and objectives of a bilingual education program be made explicit in order to permit establishment of valid criteria for determining program success or failure. The goal statements should include outcomes beyond those specifically concerned with student achievement.

Evaluators working in a bilingual setting must also become familiar with a variety of program features which are frequently absent in a unilingual setting. They must also build into the evaluation plan a variety of formative tasks. These tasks should include examination of

program implementation to suggest areas of program improvement and careful documentation of the implemented features and their relationships. Evaluators must also attempt to improve their summative evaluation activities, for example, in their estimations of which program features contribute to program outcomes.

Evaluators of bilingual programs must ensure that the appropriate program features or variables are selected for evaluation. The evaluation itself--design, measures, analyses, and reporting--should be technically sound, acceptable under existing regulations, and sensitive to the needs and constraints of the program under examination.

The aims can be facilitated by: reviewing the operant regulations; examining the program plan or description of the program (if such a plan or description exists); determining (in consultations with program participants) which features of the program need to be evaluated; deciding upon the means to evaluate these features; selecting methods to ensure ongoing documentation of their implementation, relationships, and cumulative effects; and considering appropriate means of reporting evaluation information to various audiences.

The kind of evaluation planning reflected above will be more feasible and effective the earlier the evaluator is involved in the program. If at all possible, evaluator involvement should occur before the program is implemented so that the evaluation plan is an integral part of the program's operation. The kind of evaluation planning described here also relies upon the existence of some program plan or description. Such program descriptions may not provide sufficient information to permit adequate evaluation planning without discussions

with program staff to elaborate intentions, achievement strategies, means of implementation, and expected outcomes. In short, the kind of evaluation planned will be influenced by the time at which the evaluator enters the program and the existence of observable and measureable program processes and outcomes.

The ease of management of a bilingual program's evaluation will depend on the care devoted to its planning. Utilization of information will be enhanced to the extent that information on important program considerations is reported in a timely manner to the appropriate decision makers.

Earlier we mentioned that in both federal and state legislation governing bilingual education considerable attention has been paid to assessment and reporting requirements. These requirements, which may include needs assessment, student assessments, program evaluation, and reporting, provide a useful source of information for the planning and management of the program's evaluation. As with other aspects of the legislation affecting bilingual education, each of the four categories of information above may vary from state to state. But depending upon the time at which the evaluator enters the program, they can provide information useful in planning an evaluation of a program before it begins, or on selecting features to evaluate in a program that is already in operation, and in the choice of instruments and methodology.

Needs assessments: The conduct of a state or local needs assessment may include requirements for reporting:

-numbers of student in the district eligible for the program including language and age

-the distribution on concentration of these students by school

- achievement levels of these students

- educational placement of these students, such as in special education classes or classes for the handicapped

- dropout and retention rates

- demographic information, such as national origin, race, family income level, and mobility rates

Student assessment. Student assessment requirements may include:

- development of criteria for student assessment

- specification of criteria for instrument selection/development

- assessment of language use such as home language, peer interaction, and language use in the classroom

- assessment of oral language, which may include language proficiency, language dominance, listening comprehension, and oral production

-assessment of student achievement, which may include reading and writing ability, course performance, and basic skills

Program evaluation. Requirements for program evaluation may include:

- program implementation information, e.g., staffing patterns, teaching methodology

- numbers of students served, including language classification, sex, age, and grade levels

- achievement of the objectives established for the program

- attitudes of people involved in or affected by the program

- program management

- staff development

- community involvement

- materials development, acquisition, and use

- per-pupil costs of the program and other cost information including use of funds

- other programs affecting students at the local level

- availability of technical assistance and other resources

Reporting. Among the audiences for all or parts of an evaluation report may be:

- federal government
- state education agency
- local school board
- school district administration
- project administration
- project staff
- students
- parents of students served
- the local community and the public at large

At the same time as addressing required evaluation components, the evaluator should be attempting to select for examination those features deemed to be important to the particular program and the setting in which it operates. A possible starting point for this decision area lies in investigation of the program to determine what it intends to accomplish via what implementation strategies. Consider the following;

Type of program. Whether a program is transitional or maintenance is an important consideration in the design and conduct of the evaluation. The evaluation techniques employed with one type of program should differ substantially from those used with the other if the evaluation is to provide a good (and useful) indication of program effect. In addition to gearing the evaluation toward kind of program, the evaluation should also consider:

- the stated goals and objectives of the program, those dealing with linguistic and educational outcomes and also those emphasizing non-cognitive outcomes

- student language proficiency in the primary language and in English at the time of their entry into the program

- length of time that students may remain in the program; expected time of exit

The criteria used in determining program effect must be sensitive to curricular intentions and the length of time for which students with differing linguistic abilities have participated in the program. Evaluations should avoid, for analysis purposes, the grouping together of students participating in programs with differing linguistic goals.

Population to be served. Given the provisions of the various legislation and regulations, the following kinds of variables, associated with student eligibility for the program, may need to be considered and examined for their effect upon the program:

- student background information, such as place of birth, cultural background, home language use, native or primary language, language use outside of the classroom

- information on student's language ability and/or dominance, such as proficiency in English and perhaps the non-English language, language dominance, understanding and speaking of English, reading and writing in English, achievement in English, understanding and speaking the non-English language, reading and writing of the non-English language

An important consideration in this category stems from the distinction between proficiency and dominance. The type of instrument selected/developed for assessment of the one may differ from that selected/developed for the other. Further, inasmuch as the definitions of student eligibility vary, so must the assessment process.

Participation of English-speaking students. The evaluator of a bilingual program should gather information with respect to the participation

of English-speaking students:

- the number and proportion of such students in the program
- their acquisition of knowledge and understanding of the culture of the children of limited-English-speaking ability
- their development of knowledge of and proficiency in a second language
- the costs associated with their participation in the program

Careful examination of the participation of these students in the program may provide information on the effect, if any, of these students on the students of limited-English-speaking ability.

Census. Census data may influence the kind of program instituted and therefore can be useful in the conduct of the local program evaluation if the students have been carefully assessed. There are at least three points the evaluator may have to consider with respect to the census provisions:

- definitions of categories used to determine eligibility
- the unit or level of reporting, such as district, school, grade
- the numbers of students in the designated category by unit of reporting

Program treatment: In deciding upon critical program features to examine, the evaluator should seek information on the following kinds of concerns:

- linguistic goals and objectives of the program and the linguistic abilities of the students for whom they are established
- the use of the non-English language and English in elective courses instruction in the required courses
- the use of the non-English language and English in elective courses and in such courses as history and culture
- the amount of instruction provided in language arts, comprehension, speaking, reading and/or writing of the non-English language

- the amount of instruction provided in language arts, comprehension, reading and/or writing of English

- instruction in the history and culture associated with the non-English language, and the history and culture of the United States

- degree to which appreciation for the cultural heritage of the children of limited-English-speaking ability is built into the instructional process and its presence in the curriculum

- participation of students in non-verbal courses, such as art, music, and physical education, and in extra curricular activities, in the regular school program

- psychological objectives of the program, such as attitude and self-concept, and the program designed for their accomplishment

- student composition of the classroom by race, national origin, cultural/ethnic group, language ability, etc., and age and level of educational attainment

While programs may work toward similar ultimate goals, the means and rate of attainment of these goals may vary. Therefore, short-term evaluations which only consider English reading may not accurately reflect program effect.

Grades to be covered and length of time students remain in the program. Grade restrictions and length of time for student participation will obviously influence the time available to accomplish objectives. Most states do not limit the grades that programs may serve nor restrict length of time students may participate. But in those states which do limit funding to certain grades or which limit the time for program participation, these restrictions must be considered in the evaluation of program effect.

Student-teacher ratio. In the planning of a bilingual program evaluation, the evaluator should address questions of:

- total number of students enrolled in the class

- total number of adults in the class and their positions, such as teacher or aide

With this kind of information, the evaluator may consider, along with other specified variables, the effect of class size/composition on student performance.

Teacher/staff requirements and qualifications. The following kinds of staff qualifications may influence program effect and are therefore important to consider:

- educational level, including degrees
- possession of a regular teaching certificate
- possession of a bilingual teaching certificate or endorsement
- ability in English and in the native language of the students being served by the program
- cultural background
- knowledge of cultural background of the students, including the ability to teach the history and culture of the United States and the native land of the students (or that of their parents)
- knowledge of bilingual methodologies
- ability to develop language skills in English and the language of the students being served by the program
- ability to teach content areas in the language of the students being served by the program, and in English

Staff training. The in-service training component of a bilingual program offers variables that may influence program effects:

- the role of the person participating in the training
- the experience and established need of the participants
- the method by which the training is delivered, e.g., in-service training workshop, courses at an institution of higher education, etc.
- the content of the training in relation to the participant's need
- the expected outcome as a result of participating in the training, e.g., bilingual certificate, improved competencies, etc.

- general effectiveness of staff training program

The nature, extent, and adequacy of staff training or technical assistance should be considered in the evaluation, since the extent to which technical assistance is received (and valued) by the program may affect both its implementation and its success.

Materials. In that the availability and use of appropriate materials may affect the program, the following variables may need to be considered:

- the extent to which materials are available for the language and cultural group being served
- the adequacy of the materials for accomplishing the program's goals and objectives
- the extent to which technical assistance is made available to the program for materials acquisition and development from materials development centers, resource centers, and state department of education
- the resources available at the local level for materials development
- the extent to which information is available as to the adequacy of the materials
- the use of the materials in the instructional process

Community participation. Both the manner in which community participation is enlisted and the representativeness of members may affect the program. The kinds of issues the evaluator may need to consider are:

- the organization through which the community systematically participates, such as a school advisory committee, district advisory committee, etc.
- the process by which committee members are selected for participation, such as appointed, and by whom, or elected
- the composition of the committee, such as language groups represented, numbers and percentages of parents, other community groups, educators, etc.
- the nature of the involvement of the community in the program, such as program planning, stating of program goals and objectives, advising the program management during the implementation phase, participating in the evaluation of the program, etc.

- the provision of adult education programs, and the participation of parents and other community members in them

The preceding list suggests the kinds of issues the evaluation may need to consider. Selection of the most important features to evaluate is no easy task and will vary from program to program. But the selection of these features and the management and conduct of their evaluation can be facilitated through examination of regulations, program plans and records, previously gathered evaluative and other kinds of information, and discussions with program staff. Evaluative feedback on these features to program staff may enhance the information's utility. Careful documentation and description of how the features were implemented and examination of their interrelations and their cumulative effect on program success will also provide useful information to program staff. Such reporting, will also be invaluable to others who may use the information reported to develop and implement their own program of bilingual education.

Even when the program features to be examined are carefully delineated, the information resulting from the evaluation will be influenced by the conditions in which the information is gathered (the design issue) and the quality of the measures used (the testing issue).

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is clear that bilingual education programs are extremely complex and address a great variety of needs and methods. Evaluation should provide greater documentation of bilingual programs in terms of their intentions and their implementation.

Evaluation must clarify exactly what a particular bilingual program is attempting to accomplish, and how the program intends to meet its goals.

Tests and other measures must be selected according to technical properties and relevance to bilingual programs. Test results should be interpreted in light of the objectives of the program. In evaluation design, variables must be specified and controlled. Design features should allow for information to improve the program (formative evaluation) and to show program effect (summative evaluation).

These procedures, if implemented at the level of the local project, will lead to more useful evaluations as well as to improved academic experiences and achievements for students enrolled in bilingual programs.

REFERENCES

Alkin, M.C., Kosecoff, J., Fitz-Gibbon, C. & Seligman, R. Evaluation and decision making: The Title VII experience. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation No. 4, Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, 1974.

Burry, J. Evaluation in bilingual education. Evaluation Comment, 1979, 6(1), 1-14.

Campbell, D.Y. & Boruch, R.F. Making the case for randomized assignment to treatment by considering the alternatives. In C.A. Bennett & A.A. Lumsdaine (Eds.) Evaluation and experiment, New York: Academic Press, 1966.

Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1966.

Cronbach, L.J. & Suppes, P. (Eds.) Research for tomorrow's schools: Desciplined inquiry for education. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Fernandes, K. Survey of needs for bilingual evaluation technical assistance. Center for the Study of Evaluation, CSE Report No. 129, June 1979.

Horst, D.P., Tallmadge, G.K., & Wood, C.T. A practical guide to measuring project impact on student or student achievement. in Measuring achievement gains in educational projects. Prepared for HEW by RMC Research Corp., Los Altos, CA, 1974.

Irizarry, R. Bilingual education state and federal mandates: Implications for program design and evaluation. CSE Report distributed by National Dissemination and Assessment Center, ESEA Title VII, California State University, Los Angeles, School of Education, 1978.

Linn, R. Evaluation of Title I via the RMC models: A critical review. In E.L. Baker & E.S. Quellmalz (Eds.), Educational testing and evaluation: Design, analysis, and policy. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication, 1980.

Rodriguez-Brown, F.V., et al. Longitudinal design considerations for the evaluation of bilingual programs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA, Chicago, IL: Bilingual Evaluation Center, 1976.

SIMULATION MATERIALS

The District

The District has a bilingual program involving three elementary schools --Talley, Cedric, Walpole, and one Junior High School--Knoll. The elementary program is a transitional K-4 exit program It has been in operation at Tally for about one year, at Cedric for about four years, and at Walpole for about eight years.

There are approximately 190 elementary students in the bilingual program. Most of them (168) speak Swabe. The remaining students, (22), speak Ono. Students were selected on the basis of informal interviews by teachers, however, there is no documentation of this. Swabe is a widely spoken language and there are plenty of instructional assessment materials available, although much of it comes from a foreign country and needs adaptation. Materials in Ono are not as common, since this is a relatively small country. In fact, teachers have been making up their own materials for their students. The elementary bilingual program teaching staff consists of nine teachers. Five are bilingual Swabe/English and one is bilingual Ono/English. Three teachers are in the process of learning Swabe to obtain certification as bilingual teachers. Each of the monolingual English speaking teachers is assisted by an aide. There are five aides in the program; four are bilingual Swabe/English and one is bilingual Ono/English.

There are approximately 123 junior high school students in the bilingual program. All of the students are speakers of Swabe. All entering students who are non-native English speakers are automatically placed in ESL until the ESL teacher determines whether they should remain in the ESL program or be placed in the regular classroom. This determination must be made within a week of the student's enrollment at Knoll Junior High School.

There are three ESL teachers and four bilingual teachers at Knoll.

The Elementary Bilingual Program Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the bilingual program are:

1. To help the student attain sufficient competency in the English language to ensure his/her proficiency in all areas of academic concern.

2. To develop students' cognitive and academic skills in reading and math in English and the native language.

3. To develop student self-concept and cultural pride.

4. To create and maintain a project staff of teachers, paraprofessional aides, and administrators with a high degree of expertise in their respective fields.

5. To create and maintain inservice and other instructional programs for the staff in order to enrich their professional development.

6. To promote an active and positive relationship between the schools and the community.

7. To promote a mutual support system and integration of the bilingual and monolingual English programs in the schools.

The Elementary Schools

Tally Elementary has 54 students in the bilingual program, 22 who speak Ono and 32 who speak Swabe. Twenty students are in the combination grades 1&2 and 32 are in combination grades 2&3. This is the newest component of the bilingual program and it is beginning its first year.

The teacher in charge of the Ono students, Mr. L., is a former ESL teacher who has obtained certification in order to protect his job. In his view, his job was threatened by the need for bilingual teachers at the school and the shortage of funds to hire more teachers. He really doesn't feel there is a need for establishing a bilingual program for so few Ono speaking students. He apparently is not aware of the growing influx of the Ono speaking population in the area due to unrest in their native country. Because of his limited proficiency in the Ono language, Mr. L. conducts all of his instruction in English and has given the Ono speaking aide, Ms. R, the responsibility for conducting instruction in Ono. He teaches reading and math every other morning and Ms. R teaches the same subjects and other content areas in the afternoons. Mr. L is confident in Ms. R's teaching skills since she had been an elementary teacher for ten years in her native country. He also feels fortunate that Ms. R had adapted and created some reading materials in Ono for the children.

The Swabe students are in two classrooms. Ms. I, who is in charge of the combination grades 1 & 2, is a credentialed bilingual teacher who team teaches with Ms. T, who is a monolingual English speaking teacher. Ms. I is the Swabe model and Ms. T the English model. Their class is grouped into four reading and four math groups. Other content areas are taught to the whole class, back to back. The combination grades 2 & 3 are

structured similarly to the class described above. Ms. J, an ESL teacher who is in the process of obtaining certification as a bilingual (Swabe/English), works with a bilingual aide.

The principal of the school, Mr. Jones, has mixed feelings about bilingual education. He doesn't see any differences between ESL and bilingual education. However, he is willing to do anything within reason to provide a good education to the limited English speaking students and, most of all, to get their achievement scores up. He hopes that this year's evaluation will show some improvement in this area.

Cedric Elementary: This school has 70 students in the bilingual program: 22 in grades 1 & 2; 34 in grades 2 & 3; and 16 in grades 3 & 4. The teachers for grades 1 & 2 and 2 & 3, Mrs. H and Mr. W respectively, are certified bilingual teachers. Each is assisted by a bilingual Swabe/English speaking aide.

Mrs. H has only been teaching for two years and strongly favors the bilingual program. However, she feels that more certified bilingual personnel are needed as well as more follow up of the students who have exited from the program. Mr. W, who has been teaching for six years, is disillusioned with bilingual education and teaching in general. He feels that the process is long and arduous and that teachers as well as administrators must constantly battle red tape and paperwork which interfere with classroom teaching. He is especially critical of over-testing and the use of irrelevant and possibly damaging tests.

Both Mrs. H and Mr. W have structured their classrooms around reading and math groups. However, the number of groups per grade per subject in

each classroom has become difficult to handle. They are seeking other ways of structuring their classrooms but the wide range of their students' language and math skills both in English and their native language make this a difficult task.

The teacher for the 3/4 combination, Ms. M, is a monolingual English speaker who is seeking certification by taking the appropriate course work. She is also assisted by an aide and team teaches with a monolingual English speaking teacher, Ms. S. Ms. M is very much in favor of the bilingual program because she has been teaching at Cedric for many years and has seen the difficulties which the school had to encounter when it tried to provide a good education to large numbers of NES/LES students by relying on a rather weak ESL program. In Ms. M's opinion, the bilingual program director and the school principal, Mrs. Hoover, had integrated former ESL personnel such as herself and other ESL teachers and aides. She also feels they have recognized the potential value of an ESL component within the bilingual program.

Ms. M has divided her class into three English reading levels and works with each group separately in English language skills. All other areas are taught to the class as a whole. She relies heavily upon her aide for providing instruction in the native language to the students. Ms. M gives her aide very careful and detailed lesson plans on math and reading in the native language. However, Ms. M feels that her aide needs more education and she is not quite sure about the aide's effectiveness.

The school principal, Mrs. Hoover, is aware of Mr. W's frame of mind and has suggested that he take a "leave from classroom teaching and become a resource teacher for the bilingual unit". She feels he could make a

contribution in improving the assessment problems and other areas of the program.

Mrs. Hoover feels that the program, which is in its fourth year, is successful although the achievement scores would not indicate this. However, she feels that the general attitude of the students in the program has improved. Furthermore, students who have transitioned into the regular English program are faring better than their pre-bilingual program predecessors. One of her goals for this year is to devise a plan for a formal follow up of those transitioned students up until they reach junior high.

Walpole elementary has 66 students in the bilingual program: 19 in grade 1; 14 in grade 2; 15 in grade 3; and 18 in grade 4. The teachers in grades 1 and 2, Mr. I and Mr. S, are bilingual teachers. Ms. Z, the grade 3 teacher, is an ESL teacher who is studying for certification as a bilingual teacher. Ms. J, who teaches the fourth grade class, is not a certified bilingual teacher and plans to retire from the teaching field at the end of the year. She is assisted by a bilingual aide.

The Walpole program is in its eighth year. All classrooms are self-contained and the bilingual teachers use whatever methods they feel work best in instruction. Students are transitioned after being in the program for two years or if they pass an English language proficiency test developed by the teachers and achieve at the Xth stanine on the TUF achievement test.

Mr. Smith, the principal, does not favor the bilingual program. He feels that the majority of the students do not achieve at the same level as the students in the regular monolingual English program. Furthermore, he has followed up a few of the students through their first year in junior

high and he concludes that the bilingual program is ineffective. However, there has been no systematic or documented follow up of students exiting the bilingual program. Mr. Smith would rather see limited English students attend an ESL course until they are ready to join the regular program.

The Junior High School Bilingual Program Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives for the junior high bilingual program are as follows:

1. Students will learn sufficient English language skills to enable them to receive instruction in the regular English program and perform successfully. This goal should be attained within one to two years after entering the program, depending on the student's level of entry skills in English, math, social studies, and science in the native language.
2. To develop student self concept and cultural pride.
3. To develop student skills in academic areas such as social studies, math, science, etc, as well as in English language skills.

Knoll Junior High has had an ESL component for seven years. Ms. K, the bilingual program director, has been trying to implement a transitional bilingual program here for the past two years. Her rationale is that the Swabe population has been steadily increasing with a sharp rise in recent immigration. Swabe students have increased from 89 last year to 123 this year. Most of the new Swabe student were non-English speakers. Furthermore, the incidence of high-school dropouts has always been high for these students. Ms. K and Ms. Neuman, who has been principal at this school for three years, feel that the bilingual program may enhance student self concept and provide additional instruction which could be beneficial to the Swabe students and have a positive effect on the dropout rate.

The teaching staff has had mixed reactions to the change. Overall, the teachers at Knoll feel that the school has a responsibility to try to provide a good education to all of its students. However there is some skepticism about bilingual education. Others fear a separation between the staff in the bilingual program and the regular English program staff. The three ESL teachers (who had been at Knoll from 3-5 years) feared for their jobs at first. However, these fears have not materialized.

One teacher, Ms. D, is studying toward the bilingual certification. In the meantime, she provides instruction for the most advanced LES students with the help of a bilingual aide. Ms. N is team teaching with a new bilingual teacher, Ms. G. They teach the non-English proficient and very limited English proficient students. Ms. J, another ESL teacher, has decided to teach social studies, paying particular attention to LEP students in her class. Four bilingual teachers have been hired since the program began. Two teachers instruct beginning and intermediate LEP students and

two instruct intermediate and advanced bilingual program students. The principal and bilingual program director felt that it would be more efficient to group students according to their language proficiency since this criterion determines what language they will receive instruction in in other content areas such as science and social studies. The beginning and intermediate students receive instruction in math and other content areas back to back in both languages. However the advanced bilingual students take some courses in the regular English program before their actual transition. Their performance in these courses is one of the transition criteria for these students.

District Background Information

There is a parental advisory board which meets about every three months. However, most of their functions revolve around fund raising for sports and other extracurricular events for the elementary schools. To date they have had no substantive involvement with curricular issues. There is sparse representation of the bilingual program students' parents and there has been little effort put forth to recruit members from this part of the community because of the language barrier and because most of the parents feel they do not have the time to do this. Minutes have been kept of all the meetings and their is ample documentation of their activities.

Some inservice training is provided to school staff. Teachers and aides are given about eight days of release time a year to attend workshops. To date teachers have attended workshops on teaching of reading to limited English proficient students, and teaching social studies and science to Swabe NES and LES students. Aides have received one three day workshop on teaching reading and vocabulary in the native language. All workshop sessions are taped, and feedback questionnaires from the participants are kept on file. The quality and participant satisfaction with the workshops varies according to the workshop leader's proficiency and style.

Evaluation Criteria for the Elementary Program

Exit Criteria: This has been a source of confusion and contention among the bilingual program director, the principals and members of the school board. The Board and some of the principals feel that students who achieve at the Xth stanine in math and reading in English, should be transferred out of the bilingual program. They also feel that if a student has been in the bilingual program for two years, he/she should be ready to join the regular monolingual English program. The bilingual program director and some of the principals feel that these criteria are not adequate for several reasons. First of all they feel that the standardized achievement test used to measure reading and math in English is biased against the bilingual program students, due to cultural bias in the items and their lack of relevance to the curriculum.

Although they would agree to including student achievement scores in reading and math in English on a more appropriate standardized test, they feel that this would not be enough. In addition, they would like to administer an "exit" language proficiency test which would examine writing and listening comprehension in English as well as reading and speaking skills. They would also prefer to use a district developed criterion referenced test relevant to their curriculum in: language skills in English; and math, social studies,and science in English or the native language. The purpose of this would be to see whether exiting students are entering the monolingual English program with the same kinds of skills and knowledge as their peers. Neither the bilingual program staff nor the monolingual English program staff has examined the similarities or differences between the curricula

of the two programs. Although they both contain similar (and in some cases the same) objectives, the instructional materials are different as are the teaching strategies. The present situation within the bilingual program is that each school has its own transfer criteria. In the older programs, such as those in Cedric and Walpole Elementary schools, students must exit the program after 2 1/2 years. Tally Elementary school has placed no time limit and relies on achievement scores and informal teacher assessment to determine transfer eligibility. No formal follow up procedures have been set up for the bilingual program students who have transferred.

Outcomes: Of the two schools, Cedric/Walpole elementary schools have tested their students on a yearly basis with a standardized achievement test on reading and math in English. This has been done for students in grades 2, 3 and 4. Most of the bilingual program students have scored lower than the students in the monolingual English program. The gap widens as the children get older. The bilingual program director blames the inadequacy of the test and the newness of the programs for these results. Board members and principals have various opinions about how to go about improving student achievement. Some board members and principals feel that greater emphasis should be placed on English language skills in the curriculum and teaching strategies. Others feel that students need more strengthening of basic skills in their own language and in English before they can do well in the monolingual English program. Neither the board nor the majority of the principals have discussed this issue with the parental advisory board. The bilingual program director and the principal of Walpole elementary feel that more parental involvement in the schools

could indirectly and positively affect student achievement by improving students' self image and study habits at home. Some of the teachers and the bilingual program director feel that it is unfair to compare the performance of bilingual program and monolingual English program students.

Evaluation Criteria for the Junior High Program

Exit criteria: Students will be exited from the bilingual program upon fulfillment of the following criteria:

1. At least one year in the program.
2. Scores on the Xth stanine on English language skills and math on the TUF standardized achievement test.
3. Satisfactory performance (or better) in a regular English program course.

The same controversies exist over these transitional criteria as for those of the elementary school program. The program director and principal are considering the deletion of #3 above because of possible traumatic effects on a student who "cannot make it" in regular classes. However, some of the Board members feel that this is a good way to find out whether a student is ready for transition.